During their meetings with US Government officials, they apparently put forward the Pakistani view of the situation in J&K and the Parliamentary and State Assembly elections in the state. It is understood that the US, officials, on their part, reterated the US Government position on the matter.

(d) The Government, of India regards J&K as an integral and inalienable part of India.

**Outstanding Dues of Maharashtra from Central Government for Providing police services**

1343. SHRI SANJAY NIRUPAM: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a sum of Rs. 19 crores was spent by State Government of Maharashtra on deputing 12 companies of State Police Force in New Delhi between May, 1990 to April, 1993 and out of which Rs. 57 lakhs is still recoverable from his Ministry;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) by when the outstanding claim of the State Government is likely to be settled?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MOHD. MAQBOOL DAR): (a) to (c) The State Government of Maharashtra had raised bills amounting to Rs. 17,22,95,606.00 toward deployment charges in respect of 12 companies of State police force placed at the disposal of Delhi Police for assisting the law and order duties between May, 1990 to July, 1993. All these bills excepting four amounting to Rs. 37,83,571.00 have since been settled. The remaining four bills had to be returned to the State Government because of incomplete documentation.

**Clogging in the Ports**

1344. SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that expansion of trade and industries in India is suffering due to chronically clogged ports;

(b) if so, whether Government have conducted any study about the extent of clogging in the ports; if so, the names of such ports; and

(c) the steps propose to be taken to improve the situation?

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI T.G. VENKATRAMAN): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

**Law for Wearing Helmets by Pillion Riders**

1345. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Delhi High Court has recently asked the Union Government to state the reasons for not enforcing the law compelling pillion riders on two wheelers to wear helmets, since its enactment in 1988;

(b) if so, whether the Union Government propose to enforce the law; and

(c) if so, by when, and if not. the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI T.G. VEN-KATRAMAN): (a) to (c) A case has been filed in the High Court of Delhi in which the petitioner has challenged the non-implementation of Section 129 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 as per which it is compulsory for the driver as well as pillion rider of a 2-whcclei to wear a helmet conforming to the standards of BIS. The Government of India has stated in its affidavit that provisions of Motor Vehicles Act including that of Section 129 need to be enforced by the enforcing agencies i.e. State Government/Union Territories. No final ordcrs/dircctions have been received in this matter from the High Court.